

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AMPHONE LOUPRASONG,

Case No. 2:24-cv-3416-JDP (P)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY JAIL  
RECREATIONAL,

Defendant.

On December 19, 2024, I ordered plaintiff to explain, within twenty-one days, why he should be allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis* despite his trust fund account statement showing an available balance of \$1,496. ECF No. 4. To date, plaintiff has not complied with that order.

To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of a case, for failure to comply with court orders or local rules. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to

1 administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v.*  
2 *Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

3 Plaintiff will be given a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss his case based  
4 on his failure to respond to the court's December 19, 2024 order. Plaintiff's failure to respond to  
5 this order will constitute another failure to comply with a court order and will result in a  
6 recommendation that this action be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause  
7 within twenty-one days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to comply with court  
8 orders. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this action, he must, within twenty-one days,  
9 explain why he should still be allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
11

12 Dated: January 24, 2025

  
13 JEREMY D. PETERSON  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28